Why the "LATTER DAY SAINTS" Marry a Plurality of Wives.

A GLANCE AT

SCRIPTURE AND REASON,

IN ANSWER TO

AN ATTACK THROUGH THE POLYNESIAN,

UPON

THE SAINTS FOR POLYGAMY.

By BENJAMIN F. JOHNSON.

Reader, the world is full of Falsehood, and our cause has many enemies, Read, therefore if you would not be DECEIVED.---After reading please lend it to your Neighbor.

SAN FRANCISCO:
PRINTED AT THE EXCELSIOR PRINTING OFFICE,
151 Clay Street, 3rd door below Montgomery.
1854.

A GLANCE AT

SCRIPTURE AND REASON,

IN ANSWER TO

AN ATTACK THROUGH THE POLYNESIAN,

UPON

THE SAINTS FOR POLYGAMY.

By BENJAMIN F. JOHNSON.

Reader, the world is full of Falsehood, and our cause has many enemies, Read, therefore, if you would not be DECEIVED.---After reading please lend it to your Neighbor.

SAN FRANCISCO:
PRINTED AT THE EXCELSIOR PRINTING OFFICE,
151 Clay Street, 3rd door below Montgomery.
1854.

NOTE.

This answer was prepared for the "Polynesian," in time for its next issue, after the attack upon us, but it was peremptorily refused, and not being able to procure its publication by others, upon the Islands, for want of material or disposition, it was forwarded to San Francisco to be issued in pamphlet form.

REPLY TO AN ATTACK BY THE "POLYNESIAN."

EDITOR OF THE POLYNESIAN—

Sir: As you have *again* opened your columns to misrepresentation and slander upon that Community of which I am a member, I feel in justice to my myself and those who would appreciate a statement in truth, to demand space through the same medium to correct the public mind in relation to that feature of our Religious Faith, which has called forth so severe a tirade, and to present Mr. "Mormon Book Reader's" true claim to an acquaintance with the doctrines and practices of the Latter Day Saints, or even with the principles of common honesty and truth.

Mr. "Reader's" endorsement to an extract from the "Congregational Journal," as being from a publication by Brigham Young, Governor of Utah, at once gives evidence of a mere pretence; as, had he been a "reader" as he claims, it would have been recognized as a brief clause from a lengthy treatise by Elder O. Pratt, setting forth in plainness the views of the Saints in relation to their "Plurality of Wives," which work he continues still to publish in Washington City, through a periodical called "*The Seer*," devoted principally to that subject, which, had he perused in honesty and candor, he could never have been led to such vindictive remarks, branding a chaste and virtuous people with adultery and seduction, crimes of which they were never guilty, and which as yet have not been in the dishonor of a wife, a sister, or daughter, throughout these peaceful valleys without that just atonement recognized by the

law of God as due to the commission of such crimes, which by the Saints are regarded as among those the most worthy of death.

How natural for those who are familiar in vices and evils themselves, to turn the eye of envious suspicion and distrust upon the characters and motives of others; how unseemly must it appear to the unsophisticated mind, when an individual or a community can overlook corruptions which are fast rendering their own vicinity and home a "brothel," and festering under the boasted institutions of their native soil, to heap scandal, calumny and disgrace upon a community of people of whose character and customs they are so entirely ignorant—as is evident in the present case. And here let me say, from knowledge gained by an experience through their whole history, and also from their present feelings and institutions, that among the many thousands of Saints in the valleys of Utah, there could not be found in the space of an entire century, the amount of those crimes which it is so customary to charge upon the "Mormons" as might be discovered within the cities of New York, New Orleans, or hundreds of other similar cities throughout Christendom, and chronicled as the tragedy of a single day. But we discover that Mr. "Reader" is not only ignorant of the history and religious character of the Latter Day Saints, as rendered by themselves, but also of the representations made by those who were never members of their society—such as Capt. Stansbury, of the United States Topographical corps, who spent with them a lengthy period while making a survey of Utah and Great Salt Lakes, in company with the late Captain Gunnison, of the United States Engineers, who had published a "History of the Mormons," before being murdered by the Piede Indians with a number of his party, while prosecuting his survey for the Pacific Railway, near the borders of the Severe Lake, in Utah Territory. Of these works, and also of Colonel Kaine's lectures before the American Historical Society upon the Persecutions, Exile and Sufferings of the Saints, together with an account of the enlistment, privations and patriotism of the "Mormon Battalion," under the command of Colonel Cook, he is no doubt also entirely ignorant, together

with the scores of statements published by other disinterested travelers. And more than all, he has, through an anxiety to become conspicuous for learning, and to appear a great stickler for virtue and morality, proved himself to an upardonable degree, ignorant of that great and principal "Book," which the "Mormons" adopt as their rule of faith and practice, called the "Old and New Testament;" but as we are never too old to learn the truth or to seek to profit by it, we propose to stir up Mr. "Reader's" memory with a few simple questions and reasonings from the "Pages of Inspiration," "the law and the testimony.'

You say truly, Mr. "Reader," that "Abraham, Jacob, Solomon and David were spoken of with approbation by the Almighty, and were not for once reproved for their plurality in marriage;" but why seek so affectedly to show a sameness in acts criminal and virtuous, asserting that "Abraham and Jacob were also guilty of falsehood, while David and Solomon were accessory to murder, and still were not reproved on the pages of inspiration," and that "lying and murder are as Scriptural acts as polygamy." Now sir, if this futile attempt has originated in your ignorance, then you are to be pitied; but, if from wilful and vindictive feelings, you should become despised by every lover of candor and truth.

Do you not know that a plurality of wives was not only sanctioned and blessed by the Almighty, but that it was practised by His commandment also; and that lying and murder are in direct contradiction to His law? Did not Abraham take Hagar to wife, after which the Lord met with him often, called him His friend, and established with him an everlasting covenant, (Genesis, 16th and 17th chapters,) and did not the angels administer to, and bless Hagar, promising that she should become the mother of a "great nation;" after which, did not Abraham marry Keturah, by whom he begat many sons? (Genesis, 25th: 1.) Did not the Lord bless Jacob with His own voice, promising that in his seed all of the nations of the earth should be blessed—leading him by inspiration to Laban, his kinsman, where he married the two sisters, Leah and Rachel, who with their handmaids, Belhi and Zilpha, became mothers to the twelve Patriarchs or of the twelve Tribes of Israel? And

to show distinctly that God approbated this polygamy in Jacob's family, do we not read that Leah, after having for a time ceased to bear children, gave to Jacob Zilpha, her handmaid, which so much pleased the Lord that He blessed her with a fifth son as an especial reward? (Genesis, 30th: 18,) and through this lineage of polygamy were not all the Holy Prophets and wise men born who wrote the Revelations, Prophesies and wisdom which God gave unto them and thereby entailed unto us the Holy Scriptures for the rule of our faith and practice? And did not even Jesus, our Saviour and Great High Priest, choose through the same lineage to be born into the world? And was not the polygamist, Moses, who no doubt had many wives, called to lead Israel and to stand between them and the anger of the Almighty, and to converse with Him face to face, until for the glory of God that rested upon him a veil became necessary to cover his person that Israel might look upon him? (Exodus, 34th: 29–35.) And when Miram, his sister, would have despised him on account of the Ethiopian woman that became his wife, after his marriage to the daughter of the Priest of Midian, was she not smitten of the Lord with leprosy that she would have died had not Moses plead with Him that her life be spared? (Numbers, 12th: 15.) And in the law which God gave through Moses, to govern Israel, was it not made obligatory upon the living to take to wife the widow of a deceased brother and raise up to him children, that his name might not be blotted out from the families of Israel? and this, too, without any regard to the number of wives that he might previously have taken; which should he fail to do, was not the widow to spit in "*his face*," and he to become disgraced in Israel? (Deuteronomy, 25th: 4–10,) with provisions made in the same law to govern the interests of the different wives and children belonging to the same husband, (Deuteronomy, 21st: 15) and does not the numerical account rendered by Moses of the numbers in Israel before they entered Canaan, show to the calculating "Reader" that out of near fifty who were born in the wilderness, only one was a *first born*, showing conclusively that those who were heads of families must have married many wives, which was no doubt rendered more practicable from

multitudes of the male children having been destroyed by Pharaoh, King of Egypt; and to provide for its continuance, was not Israel commanded to spare alive the Midianite virgins for themselves (Numbers, 31st: 18,) with those also of many other nations, while every male was put to the sword? (Deuteronomy, 20th; 13–14.) And was not Gideon the mighty man, who had seventy sons born in his own house, besides, no doubt, many daughters, called of God through the ministration of angels to deliver Israel, being a great and a good man? (Judges, 8th: 30.) Was not David, after marrying seven wives, called a man "after God's own heart" and exalted to the throne of Israel? and after the transgression and death of Saul, who had many wives, does not the Prophet Nathan declare that God had given them also into the bosom of David the King, and that if all of his wives, with the kingdom which he had received, had been "too little," that the Lord would have added unto him still more, had he not become guilty? (2 Samuel, 12: 8) and was not Solomon blessed with all of his wives until, contrary to the Commandments of God, he took wives from the idolatrous nations, for which he was cursed by the voice of the Lord unto himself, foretelling the destruction and almost entire overthrow of his kingdom, which occurred in the reign of his son? (1 Kings, 11th.) And did not Jehoida, the Lord's High Priest, take two wives for Joash, the King of Judah, who was a righteous man and redeemed Israel from idolatry, destroying the temples of Baal and repairing the house of the Lord? (2 Chronicles, 24: 3.) And was not the beginning of the word of the Lord unto the Prophet Hosea, that he should take to himself a wife, after which he was commanded to take a second? (Hosea, 1--2: 3--1.)

Now, Mr. "Reader," do not all of these evidences, with the scores of others which you cannot but recollect, if you are familiar with that most common of all "Mormon Books," the "Holy Bible," show conclusively that God not only sanctioned and blessed this institution, but that it was by His direct commandment also; and although you would feign set forth to the credulous that polygamy was sinful and adulterous, yet you can not but know (if you are a "reader,") that under the Patriarchal

and Mosaic statutes, there was no greater crime known than that of prostitution and adultery, which was atoned for alone through the death of the guilty, and was not this law given and imposed in Israel, while Moses, who received it from the Almighty, with many others in Israel, had many wives? Was not death the fate of near the whole city by whom Dinah, the daughter of Jacob, was defiled? (Genesis, 24th chapter.) And was not the camp of Israel preserved from the fierce anger of the Almighty through the speedy putting to death of all those who had committed adultery in the camp? (Numbers, 25th.) And was not almost the whole tribe of Benjamin at one time put to the sword for their adulterous and illicit practices? (Judges, 19--20 : 21st chapter.) And in the Law which God gave to Israel did He not provide this penalty for those who were found in adultery, by their being stoned to death without the gates of the city? And was not such the strictness of that law, that even the young bride, should she fail to produce the evidence of her virginity, was doomed to the same sad death and suffered its penalty? (Deuteronomy, 22 : 21.)

And, now Mr. "Reader," in view of all of these and *many other positive* evidences that the plurality of wives was an order not only instituted and blessed by the Almighty, but that a violation of such marriage covenants was punished by death, how could you unblushingly declare that such a practice like "lying and murder" were "in violation of a positive command," and that lying and murder are as Scriptural acts as polygamy.

Now, sir, in what latitude of Scripture reason, or honesty, are you? Would you not do well to take an observation and learn your *whereabouts?* Does not God emphatically say in the "decalogue," "Thou shalt not lie," "nor bear false witness against thy neighbor," and that "thou shalt not kill," and that "whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed?" Now will you show to us one text between the lids of the Old and New Testament, reprobating the doctrine of a plurality of wives, or for once regarding it with disrespect? Then, sir, why resort to a misrepresentation so apparently false as seeking to blend in one the virtuous and criminal acts of the ancient Patriarchs and Prophets?

Upon what principle of *Scripture* or *truth*, do you venture the assertion that "Abraham and Jacob were guilty of falsehood," and that "David and Solomon were accessory of murder and still were not reproved on the pages of Inspiration?" Would you charge upon "faithful Abraham," the "friend of God," "falsehood," for saying to Abimelech, King of Egypt, that Sarah was his sister? If you are that ignorant, "read" on, and you may learn that she was his sister—the daughter of his father, Terah—(Genesis, 20: 12.) But as for Jacob, we doubt not but he would plead guilty of a subterfuge whereby to secure that blessing promised to him by the Lord through Rebecca, his mother, (Genesis, 25: 23,) which pertained also to the birthright, which he had legally purchased of Esau, his brother; (Genesis, 25: 33) from which may we not conclude that this transaction passed without the merit of severe reproof from the Almighty?

But in the selfish and willful murder of which David was more than accessory (for which you say he was not reproved) is *surely* another and a distinct subject. Did you, really, Mr. "Reader," fancy that an intelligent community, with the Bible in their hands, would creduously believe all of your assertions and misrepresentations because they were made against the "Mormons," without one moment of reflection. Can they not read for themselves in 2 Samuel 12th chapter, and learn that the Lord sent the Prophet Nathan to David the King, reproaching him with the murder of which he had been guilty, telling him that the "sword should never depart from his house," and that "evils should arise in his family;" "that his wives should be given to his neighbor," and "that the child born of the wife which he had so unjustly taken, for which he felt so great an affection, should die, and all for his great sin, in the death of Uriah. And from his own writings, does it not appear evident that he anticipated being cast into Hell, when he says, speaking of his Redeemer, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell nor suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption," which prediction was quoted by the Apostle Peter as literal, and the latter portion applied as proof of the resurrection of the body of Christ, (16th Psalm, 9--10—Acts, 2: 29.) But as for Solomon, where was he guilty of being accessory to murder? Was it in obeying the last

commandment of his father David who, upon surrendering to him his kingdom, gave it as a last great charge that he should not let Joab, who had shed innocent blood, or Shimai, by whom he had been "sorely cursed," go down to the grave in peace? (1 Kings, 2: 5--9.) Or was it in the death of Adonijah, his brother, who was not only guilty of usurpation, but also of seeking the Shumanite damsel to wife in dishonor of his father's bed? (1 Kings, 2.) Now, sir, there is no one who will marvel at the witholding of your name from so flagrant a malpractice in Scripture, reason and truth, which could not become sanctified to the minds of a reflecting and honest community, not even with the Reverend name of one who "makes merchandise of the Gospel."

Having so plainly shown from all these *stubborn* though simple facts, that a plurality in marriage was practised by the great, wise and holy men of ancient days, whose virtues and faith secured to them the favor of Heaven, the society of angels, eternal covenants with God while conversing with Him face to face and beholding His glory, with power to command the Heavens, the earth and the fountains of the deep, to the overthrow and destruction of these enemies, and to secure promises that the children of their different wives should be blessed to the latest generation, and become the fathers of the mightiest nations upon the earth, what can you now think of your sacriligeous slander upon their moral and religious character, in declaring that these marriage relations were contracted like "lying and murder" "in opposition to a positive command?"

How pretending, hypocritical and presumptuous for the apostate churches of the present day, who have never conversed with the Almighty, been visited by angels, received visions or revelations, and who would upon any one who should profess even the gift of prophesy, cry out—*false prophets, delusion, blasphemy!* &c., whose hundreds of religious creeds are characterised alone by contradictions and a want of foundation in Scripture, truth or reason, separating their votaries to the extremest antipodes in religious faith — "one, providing salvation for the *damnedest wretch;*" while the "other dooms the *guiltless infant to the flames of Hell!*"

"While in religious feud see brothers meet,
And Christian nations strew the earth with slain
And red the sea with human gore!"

Leaving mankind, for want of precept in truth, with Christian examples, in ignorance and confusion in relation to those Scriptures which should make them "wise unto salvation."

How sickening to the reading and reflecting mind, to see the hireling priesthood of the present day, in all the darkness of their minds, raise their hands in *holy horror* in view of those virtuous and sacred marriage institutions, and with their eyes turned in Pharisaic hypocrisy towards Heaven, exclaim with sanctimonious affectation—immorality! immorality!! Are they called upon in all of their blindness and ignorance in the things of God, to set up a standard of morality and virtue for those who spent their whole lives in favor and communion of the Almighty? Shall they stand forth in their *human wisdom*, which our Saviour declares is foolishness with God, and dictate rules and discipline for those who received and wrote for them the pages of Inspiration? Let every candid, thinking mind respond.

As it appears so evident that polygamy did exist with the Jews at the appearance of our Saviour, we would ask in what instance did He discard its practice, or by what declaration from Him was it done away? If the Christian dispensation could tolerate but one wife, and no man could be admitted into the church with a plurality, then how unfortunate those brothers who, to escape disgrace in Israel, were compelled to take perhaps many widows, together with those who from choice had married more wives than one; for, does not our Saviour declare that "whosoever putteth away his wife save for fornication, causeth her to commit adultery," and that him who married her would commit adultery also, (Matthew, 5: 23,) thereby debarring him forever from the Kingdom of God, unless his wives are induced to commit adultery, whereby he would become divorced and they sunken in sin and infamy, to be banished from the presence of God! What husband would abandon to disgrace and perdition the trusting and affectionate wife of his bosom—the mother of his children—for a name in the Christian

Church? Who would accept even salvation at such a price? How frail and inconsistent then is the argument adduced to prove that polygamy was reprobated by our Saviour and His Apostles. Who would dare to assert upon Scripture authority that the plurality was practised only by those who were ignorant of the Gospel of *Christ?* Does not the Apostle tell us that the "Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation?" (Romans, 1: 16.) Then if the ancient polygamists became heirs of salvation, must they not have become acquainted with the "Gospel of Christ?" Does not the Apostle declare that Moses "esteemed the reproach of Christ greater than the riches of Egypt?" (Hebrews, 11: 26,) and also that the Gospel, (Galatians, 3d and 8th) was preached in the days of Abraham? And would it not appear unreasonable to suppose that men to whom the Almighty unveiled the Heavens and unfolded the destiny of earth and of the children of men until the latest generation, would still remain ignorant of the Gospel of Salvation and even of the principles of virtue and morality? Is it not declared in the Scripture that "God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever," and that "His ways are one eternal round," and that "He changes not;" neither "shadow of turning in all of His ways." Then if the Gospel of Christ was preached in the days of Moses and Abraham, without which there was no salvation, and God is unchangeable in His ways, how then can it be it be said that the Gospel does not admit of polygamy? Who is so ignorant as to suppose that "plurality of wives" pertained only to the law of Moses—was it not established under the Melchisedec and eternal priesthood, while *Adam* was yet upon the earth (Genesis, 4th,) hundreds of years before the Mosaic dispensation? Does it not therefore appear evident that a knowledge of the Gospel was cotemporary with polygamy, and that its practice must have existed under the organization of the Christian Churches? If not, why did Paul instruct Timothy to choose men for Bishops and Deacons who had married but one wife, if a plurality was not allowed in the church—why not simply caution him to beware of adulterers? Does he not tell Timothy that one wife is necessary to prove a man capable of governing his own house, without which ability

he would be unfit for the office of Bishop; and have we not good reason to suppose that such selections were made that those who were called to fill the various offices of the church might not be trammeled with the cares of a numerous family—and if a plurality was not to be tolerated in the Christian dispensation, why did Isaiah, whose whole writings are filled with predictions in relation to the latter days when Jerusalem should be redeemed and Zion established, to become the great cities of refuge for the meek of the earth, where they should enjoy a communion with God and be safe from the universal calamities which are to render the earth desolate prior to the reign of universal Peace? Why does he, speaking of that day, declare that seven women should lay hold upon one man and say—"we will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach"—(Isaiah, 4th chapter,) declaring that all who were then left in Zion and Jerusalem should be holy, and that the Lord would create upon all their dwelling places a shadow by day and a shining by night, and are not those women such as are to be spared alive, while men reject the law of God and fall by sword, famine, pestilence, hail and fire, the account of which is so plainly portrayed by the Prophets and also by Christ and His Apostles?

And were we called upon, we should feel abundantly able to show, not only that our Saviour honored this doctrine of polygamy, by being born into the world through such a lineage, but that He adopted and practised it himself in a marriage with Mary, Martha and Mary Magdalene, which is not only shown by the predictions of the Prophets, but by His general demeanor and intercourse with them, whose affections for Him were in every way demonstrated by kindness, solicitude and attention; and such being His love for Mary and Martha that He sympathized in the death of their brother, and wept with them over his tomb, manifesting such especial regard for the sister of Martha that she became known as "the Mary whom Jesus loved;" His marriage to whom, no doubt, occurred at Canaan of Galilee, where His mother, who officiated, called upon Him to furnish wine for the guests which was so miraculously produced by the changing of water into wine—His wives follow-

ing Him whithersoever He went—being the last at the Cross and the first at the Sepulchre—unto whom he also first appeared after His resurrection from the dead.

Whosoever should doubt that our Saviour was to marry, let them turn to the 45th Psalm, where David, speaking of a personage whom he calls God, says that "kings' daughters shall be among his honorable women," which if properly rendered from the original, would read "honorable wives," while the "queen of Heaven should stand upon his right hand clothed with gold of Ophir," who is comforted with the assurance that the King shall greatly desire her beauty—bidding her, as he is lord, to worship him; and to show that this was to be literal, Paul quotes the sixth and seventh verses of the 45th Psalm in Hebrews, 1: 8--9, showing distinctly that this personage who was called God—who was to have a *queen* in Heaven, with kings' daughters for his honorable wives, was no other than the Son of God himself.

Do you marvel, Mr. "Reader," at this, while marriage appears so necessary to the future glory, as well as to the present happiness of man;—does it not appear evident from Scripture and reason that such relations existed in the eternal worlds before this earth was formed from the elements which existed, and that through those conjugal relations, the spirits of men were begotten and born unto Him "who is our Father in Heaven?" If not, who were all the "Sons of God who shouted for joy," and the "Morning *stars* that sang together," when the foundations of the earth were laid? (Job, 38: 7.) If Jesus is the "Son of God," "our elder brother," and we are really his brother as is so plainly set forth in the Scriptures, then *reason* and *analogy* would teach us that there must be a mother also, as well as a father in heaven—did not Jesus say that He did nothing but what He saw His Father do—then must not His Father have passed through a similar probation to secure a tabernacle, and contracted those conjugal relationships through which Jesus, with all of His younger brethren, the sons of God were begotten in the spirit world? To whom was the Father conversing when He said—"Let *us* make man in *our own* image, *male* and *female*?" With whom would a father converse upon

the welfare of his children, if not with their mother? Does He not create man in the singular number, both *male* and *female* in the image of God, showing that both were necessary to produce His image, the woman being taken out of man, to show that she was designed as a portion of himself, who being returned unto him again, he becomes perfect through the decree that "they twain shall become one flesh"—and does not the Scriptures say that "the man is not without the woman in the Lord," and that "the glory of man is the woman?" Are not these good evidences and fully sufficient to show, not only that our spirits were begotten in some previous world, but that the earthly tabernacles of man were created in the image of God, *male* and *female*, both being required to constitute man in the full image of God, by whom they were endowed with that procreative principle, whereby the earthly bodies of men may be produced in this life, and by which spirits may be gendered in that life which is to come—"to fill their space in uncreated worlds? And in view of this great subject, does not the Prophet, in speaking of Jesus, say that He should be called the "Everlasting Father"—a "Prince of Peace"—and again, that "to the increase of His dominion their should be no end?" Now, if He is the Son of God, "our elder brother," how can He become an "Everlasting Father" to us — and if to the "increase of His dominion there is to be no end," when this world is subdued and delivered up to the Father, how is His dominion to increase if other worlds are not organized by Him, and like our planet, peopled with begotten intelligences, which being His own offspring, would He not then become in reality an "Everlasting Father?" Hence, do we not see that to become perfected like His Father, and to prepare for "endless increase," He must from necessity have provided the queen of Heaven, with other honorable wives, with whom He would become one in the realization of an endless and eternal increase?

But to proceed with this subject, we should be led to the broad field of previous existence, as well as to the future state of man, where, with those connubial and parental relations, which will forever exist among those "whom God hath joined together," His saints are to become one with Him in the

inheritance of thrones, dominions, principalities and powers, "through endless ages yet unborn are endless and unnumbered worlds to come."

> Upon this theme were I here called to dwell,
> 'Twould be a light and pleasant task to show,
> That we, in a far brighter world, were spirits born
> To Him who is our Father still—tho' past, before
> To an eternal rest, thro' a low sphere
> Of sorrow, toil and death, like our dark world;
> And as our Father did so may we do,
> Till we in fullness rise, like Him on high
> To knowledge, glory and progressive power;
> Till worlds on worlds, and offspring like the sand
> Shall fill their sphere, in broad Infinity
> With the unnumbered worlds which now in order roll,
> Plain to our view throughout the vast expanse of Heaven.

But let us leave this subject and pass on to consider the text to which we are referred, together with your argument to prove that such a doctrine is unscriptural and licentious, which is a quotation by our Saviour from the words of Adam, as chronicled by Moses in Genesis second—"For this cause shall a man forsake his father and mother and cleave unto his wife (not wives,) and they twain (not three or four,) shall become one flesh." Here let me ask again by whom were all of the laws, precepts and commandments of the Old Scriptures received, written and enforced, which so often speak of wife in the singular, if not by Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David and scores of other prophets, seers, priests, kings, judges and just men who dwelt in communion with the Almighty, surrounded by their many wives and numerous children; by all of whom, as well as by Christ and His Apostles the word wife was spoken in the singular number, which was no doubt rendered thus from the fact that many, and perhaps a majority in Israel were not worthy, or did not choose to marry a plurality; and the laws governing a relationship with one wife, being applicable and fully adequate in the case of many, from which it appears there was no necessity for its being otherwise regarded; and it is said that "they twain shall become one flesh," which you say is "not three or four?" How strange that a man should become one with "three or four" wives! Does not Jesus say that He and

His Father are one, and pray that His saints may become one with Him—showing that all may become one with Him and His Father, yet do not each retain their volition and individual identity. When a man takes to himself a wife and "they twain become one flesh"—how should it detract from his ability to marry and become one with a second, third, or any other number, and with each wife to form a compact of oneness to produce, through the laws of generation, an offspring, the fruit of their own bodies, in which they literally become one flesh. When Jacob married Leah and they became one, what relation in that oneness could Rachel sustain, or when he received Rachel to wife, how could Leah become identified in that compact, or how does it appear that Bilhi or Zilpha were less his wives or less one with him than were Leah and Rachel—Each wife being the mother of her own children, is the evidence of her individuality and her oneness with Jacob — is it not therefore evident that had Jacob married still many other wives, with each he would have become *one;* while it is nowhere written, and would be contrary to reason that twain women or a plurality of men should ever become one flesh. This subject cannot but appear plain to those who can profit by the simplicity of truth.

But, Mr. "Reader," how shall we regard this dispensation of *new light* which you have just brought forth to illuminate the world upon the subject of "plurality" of "husbands" which was never before fully discovered even by *wise barbarians?* Are you really possessed of your ordinary reason, when you say that "if a man marry a plurality of wives, a woman may marry a plurality of husbands," and "no one can object to this," asserting it equally as reasonable for women as for men to adopt the practice? Now if you are in a reasoning capacity, pray tell where is one *rule of law* in Scripture, physiology or common sense, to sustain such a declaration, or how from analogy can you raise such an argument?

What would virtuous Sarah have replied to an insinuation upon her morality and virtue so scandalous and unmerited, to protect whose chastity, God smote the whole house of Abimileck, king of Egypt, who looked upon her as being only

Abraham's sister—how highly would the faithful wives of all the holy men of old feel complimented by your ignorant or wilful misrepresentation, after all of their examples of unsuspected virtue and faithfulness, calling their husbands lords and honoring them with a fulness of their confidence and affection.

Suppose, Mr. "Reader," that we glance through the Scriptures to learn the true sphere and capacity of woman and her natural relationship with man.

Did not God first form the man and place him in the garden with dominion over the earth—then took from him a *rib* of which he made woman, who was returned to him as a "help meet?"—(Genesis, second chapter,)—an auxiliary, a "weaker vessel," "called woman because she was taken out of man;" and did not God say unto her "that in sorrow she should bring forth children, that her desire should be unto her husband and that he should rule over her?" (Genesis, 3: 16.)

And where upon the "pages of Inspiration," is there one evidence that woman was designed to fill a sphere equal with man, or how could it appear consistent with her physical organization—does not the Apostle say that as the glory of God is the man, so also is the glory of man the woman—"that the man is not of the woman, but the woman is of the man and was created for him (1 Corrinthians, 11: 7, &c..) and again does he not say that the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the Church, and as the Church should be subject to Christ, so also should a wife be in subjection to her husband?" Does he not teach wives to reverence their husbands, referring them for example to "holy women of old who were in subjection to their husbands," referring them also to Sarah "who called Abraham lord" and gave him Hagar her handmaid to wife. And is not the feelings and capacity of woman in accordance with the declaration of the Lord unto Eve, that she should "bring forth children" and her "desire should be unto her husband?" Is not her calling to become a mother congenial with her softness, patience, solicitude and affection, with which she is so wisely endowed, which appears so needful to her who is to bring forth and nourish the tender and helpless infant, which calling was esteemed by the wise women

of ancient days as the blessing above all earthly price, honoring their husbands with that universal reverence and affection which is due from the Church unto Christ who is the head. And did not the holy men and women of those days whose chastity secured the communion of God and the society of angels, observe the most rigid discipline throughout the whole period of Uturo Gestation and even to the day of weaning—rendering it in joy and festivity next to the day of marriage—which custom has been supplanted by the vitiated appetites and demoralizing practices originating under the more modern and corrupt institutions of men—perverting the dictates and laws of Nature and lowering in the scale of being the fair and lovely daughters of Eve to a sphere which I shall here refuse to describe.

With this view of the doctrines and practices of the Saints, how gross and calumnious as well as cowardly and ignorant are all of your speculations upon the honored wives and chaste daughters of peaceful and Happy Deseret in relation to their "plurality of husbands." With what *scorn* and *contempt* you would be spurned from their quiet and cheerful domicils or from their joyous and merry social assemblies! With all who, like yourself, can realize nothing in the human affections but the ability "to gratify lust," and who can feel no affinity for that pure, refined and virtuous love, the birthplace and sphere of which is the unsophisticated heart, governed by the law of experience and reason, kindling up that warm glow of kindness, friendship and true affection in which mind associates with mind in mutual solicitude and sympathy "through all the joys of life,"—renders all men brothers—earth a paradise, and home a Heaven.

But let us proceed: your quotation teaching husbands to "love their wives as themselves, is good, and the instruction is compatible with the whole tenor of Scripture; but how poverty struck is your argument based upon it, how strange that so much love should have been required. How difficult for a husband to love as himself even one wife, and how impossible that he should cherish such a regard for many. Your futile argument here merits no more than the notice of silence, yet I will ask if we are not commanded to "love the Lord our God with *all* of

our *hearts*, might, mind and strength, and our neighbor as ourselves." Now in your reasoning, what a *dilemma*—as to love the Lord with *all* our *hearts*, mind and strength, would not admit of love even for one wife, or ourselves—and behold we are commanded to love as ourselves not only our wives but our neighbors, including thousands of wives and daughters of other men, as all should be neighbors—all to be loved as we love ourselves, and this required by our Saviour. How deplorable the condition of man for so enormous a tax upon his love!

Now, Mr. "Reader," what do you think of this attempt at perverting the Scriptures, by presenting the sensual impulses of natural man in place of that disinterested and holy love which should unite the hearts of all the sons of men, and cause them as brethren to dwell together in unity;

> "Which love caused Him who first the precept gave
> To bend His way to earth and give His life for fallen, sinful man."

But before leaving this subject, let me ask who had supposed that Rachel was loved less by Jacob for his marriage with Leah, or that Leah was despised when he received Rachel to wife, or that Bilhi was forgotton or neglected because of Jacob's love or attention to Zilpha? What parent is so unnatural as to forsake the first because a second child is born, or if he be the father of many children, will he love the eldest and despise the youngest, or will he cleave to the youngest and forsake the eldest? The heart of each parent will decide.

Does not that affinity, which is the offspring of experience and reason, like the love of God, remain unchanged to each, though shared by many worthy objects?

Your first great argument in relation to a portion of males being deprived, through polygamy, of marriage relations, I had nearly overlooked, but will now ask upon it a few parting questions and perhaps make a closing remark.

Inasmuch then as man is called to stand at the head with dominion over the earth—to fill all of the responsible and business callings of life—to preside in the domestic circle—to stand by the helm of State—to martial the multitudes upon the battle fields—to traverse the boundless deep with the thousands of

ships for war or freighted with the merchandise of various climes, and to explore the heavens, the earth and the sea—to acquire wisdom and knowledge; from each of which calling he gathers the object of his pursuit—the glory to which he aspires. But how widely from this is the sphere and calling of her whose desire should be unto her husband, who, we are told should be the glory of man—whose world is the domestic circle—and whose glory is her children—the hope of her declining years. Where then are the multitudes of females who would number with those who are by the "glory" of wealth or fame, and as seamen or soldiers, lose their lives or forego the marriage relation, besides those who from circumstances or choice neglect to contract that happy relationship—without reference to the great numbers who from their profane and wicked lives, render themselves unworthy of the high trust of woman's happiness or of the education of her children.

How unhappy then must be the prospects of the many thousands who perhaps may never for once receive the offer of marriage from a virtuous man, and who were designed by nature to honor the sacred name of wife and mother, and cheer the pathway of man by those happy smiles and joyous words which eminate alone from woman's heart while filling that high and holy sphere "for which by Nature's God she was designed."

But what does the true picture and reality unfold to our view? Look at the hundreds of nunneries throughout Christendom, in contradiction to the first great command, through disappointed expectations closing the visions of virtue and loveliness forever from the sight of a priest-ridden world. Look at the factories throughout Europe and America, thronged with multitudes of the softer sex toiling to amass wealth for the sordid capitalists, and to the thousands of close and sultry sewing establishments throughout the largest cities, crowded with pale and sickly women—doomed, through want of man's protection, in poverty to draw with *feeble hand* the careful stitch to gratify the fastidious fashions of folly, cruelty and wealth, until death, their almost only friend, closes for them the sad and toilsome scene;—such is the yearly fate of tens of thousands as the "reader" of "statistics" may discover.

But for a picture more wretched still and by far worse than all, look upon the hordes of those who were once blooming in health and innocence, the fairest of their sex, now sunken in prostitution and guilt, doomed through disappointed hopes "or foul seduction's art" to welter in wretchedness and irretrievable ruin!—while the faithless husband decoys to his treacherous and unhallowed embrace, through sophistry and art, the pride of some fond parent, or her who is without protection, and thereby installs a miss, instead of a second honored and lawful wife, and sends forth to beggary and shame the fruits of an illicit intercourse with the mother who is now despised and sinks another grade in guilt, shame and remorse!

Such is the condition of hundreds of thousands, while Christian Governments are cherishing prostitution and adultery, by licensing houses for obscenery and corruption in all of their principal cities.

Such, Mr. "Reader," is the increasing condition of the world, which is fast ripening for that great revolution and overturn, which has been so plainly delineated by Prophets, Apostles and by Jesus himself, which is to roll in upon the earth preparatory to His second Advent. And let me here declare to you and unto all men, that the Kingdom of God is now being established upon the earth, no more to be thrown down forever, and that the holy priesthood has again been restored through the ministry of holy angels and the revelations of God; and we His servants now call upon you and all men everywhere to repent and be baptized by immersion for the remission of your sins, then with zealous hearts and fixed determinations to live virtuously and holy before the Lord—seek to gather out from the wickedness and corruptions of the world, to the place He has appointed for the gathering of His Saints, where they may escape the calamities and judgments that await the present nations of the earth, and prepare for the coming of the Son of Man, and for that day of universal rest, when the meek shall inherit the earth.

But before leaving you entirely Mr. "Reader," let us take a moment's further glance at this dark picture of wretchedness and corruption which is fast cankering the vitals of all the civil institutions throughout the world and fast increasing in rapine,

arson, strife and war priesteraft, sorcery, envy and distrust; while under the boasted institutions of American liberty, thousands of the Saints have been robbed, spoiled and exiled by the hand of violence and oppression, and left in destitution and want, to wend their way amid storms of winter, poverty, sickness and death, through an unknown, trackless and forbidding country to their present isolate and distant home. While the blood of the Prophets of God, with many of His Saints, was smoking from the ground, and the tears of the lone and destitute widow dropped in silence to the memory of a devoted husband—while, from the hundreds of orphans has ascended the cry of bereavement and want to the ears of the Almighty, whose increased displeasure, will ere long be visited upon the guilty and disobedient sons of men;—such is the dark and pitious prospect without repentance of our present world.

Yet there is one lone spot where truth and virtue reigns—one city of refuge from the anarchy and distress of the crumbling nations, and from the destroyer's grasp!

There the bright star of Deseret is rising fast—over the snow-crest tops of the "everlasting hills," where is perched the Eagle of Liberty, Freedom and Equal Rights, watching the sinking institutions of mortal man, and for that happy period when, with the unfurled banner of universal liberty, she can sore aloft and spread her golden wings on all the broad expanse of earth.

Such is the future to peaceful Utah — where a house of prostitution will never be known — and where the seducer of female chastity dare not raise his *cursed head*—where the law of God is known and kept inviolate—where *wives* are honored, and between offspring there is no distinction, and children are a desirable "heritage"—there the name of God is not profaned, and drunkenness is not beheld in the streets—and the Sabbath is holy—and there is Brigham Young, the "sensualist," the "adulturer" and "seducer,"—the Prophet and chosen of God and the beloved of all his Saints.